

# Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery Water Intake Project and Icicle Creek Restoration Project

# GOAL (Group Objectives and Logistics) Team Stakeholder Objectives Development – DRAFT Meeting Notes

# September 06, 2006 NMFS/FWS Offices, Room 261, Lacey, WA

Attendees: Dale Bambrick (NMFS), Kurt Beardslee (Washington Trout), Dennis Carlson (NMFS) Brian Cates (USFWS), Julie Collins (USFWS), Tom Cook (Reclamation), Jim Craig (USFWS), Jessica Gonzales (USFWS), Jan Grote (USFWS), Mark Hersh (Washington Trout), Chris Jansen Lute (Reclamation), Lori LeVander (WA DOE), David Morgan (USFWS), David Murillo (Reclamation), David Palumbo (Reclamation), Dave Schneider (WA DOE), Tom Scribner (Yakama Nation)

## Step 1: Identify Items Believed to be Important, Group Objectives, and Areas of Concern

### 1. Water Intake Project

- a. Ladder
  - i. Upstream Passage (C)
    - 1. Coho and Chinook
- b. Meet Hatchery Production Goals
- c. Upgrade Screening at Diversion
  - i. Eliminate Entrainment
- d. Evaluate Pump Back System
- e. Replace Pipeline

#### 2. Icicle Creek Restoration Project - Structure 5 (C)

- a. Maintain Minimally Invasive (C)
  - i. Footprint (C)
  - ii. Degree of Human Interaction (C)
- b. Minimize and/or Restore Lost Opportunities (C)
- c. Minimize Stray Rates (C)
- d. Must be logistically Feasible
- 3. Hatchery O&M
  - a. Maintain Production Targets
  - b. Maintain Production Flexibility
  - c. Assure Redundancy
  - d. Water Supply Requirement
    - i. No Adverse Effect to Fish

Key: C: Identified Areas of Special Concern

Deleted: I

# RECLAMATION Managing Water in the West

- 4. Screen at Intake to Eliminate Entrainment (See also Water Intake Project)
- 5. Fish Passage at the Intake (See also Water Intake Project) (C)
- 6. Ability to avoid Disease and Provide Pathogen Free in Water (as disease free as possible)
- 7. Ability to Treat Water
- 8. Water Quality Standards (C)
  - a. pH
  - b. DO (9.5 mg/L)
  - c. T (16 C)
- 9. Continued ability to collect Brood Stock
  - a. LNFH
  - b. Tribe
- 10. Improve Steam Flow (Addressed in Recently Published Biological Opinion) (C)
  - a. Water Level Icicle Creek
- 11. Restore Ecological Processes as Related to Hatchery Operations (C)
- 12. Ability to Regulate Flows at Headgate (Structure 2) (C)
  - a. Ground Water Recharge (C)
  - b. Flood Control (C)
- 13. Ensure Spillway Attraction Water (C)
- 14. Is Compatible with Laws (C)
  - a. ESA(C)
  - b. CWA(C)
  - c. Washington State Fish Passage (C)
  - d. Safety
  - e. All applicable state and federal laws
- 15. Protect Tribal Interests
  - a. Fishery
  - b. Cultural
  - c. Spiritual
- 16. Protect Native Fish (C)
- 17. Flood Control
  - a. O&M
  - b. Passage (C)
- 18. Enable Shared Water Use
- 19. Accountability and Monitoring Program (C):
  - a. Determine Data Points
  - b. Establish Collection Method and Personnel
  - c. Implement Review Program
- 20. Economic Cost (C)

Key: C: Identified Areas of Special Concern

Deleted: Insure



1.

# Step 2: Distill and Develop Goals/Objectives that are Identified as an Area of Concern

Water Supply	
a. Goals/Objectives	
i. Provide a reliable and adequate water supply compatible wi	ith in-stream
Commend and a section and the standards	Deleted:
b. Possible Solutions	
i. Gravity Water Supply	
1. New 1 mile plus pipeline with similar alignment to	existing
pipeline	Deleted:
2. Same point of diversion (POD),	Deleted:
3. Will require pump back system.	Deleted:
a. Will improve in-stream flow,	Deleted:
b. Will provide tempered water for frazil ice	Deleted:
<ol> <li>May include land issues including ownership.</li> </ol>	
ii. Pressure System	
<ol> <li>May move POD downstream, possibly to hatchery.</li> </ol>	Deleted:
2. No significant pipeline required	Deleted:
	Deleted:
4. May need to maintain supply to irrigator,	Deleted:
<ul> <li>Cascade Irrigation District (CID) turnout is of</li> </ul>	down stream of
current POD	Deleted:
<ul> <li>May have to maintain existing diversion for</li> </ul>	irrigator.
<ol> <li>Will need to maintain screening.</li> </ol>	
c. May explore all options to provide CID water	er (including
buyout)	· _ in land in
5. May not need to screen at new POD,	Deleted: .
iii Screening at intake at current diversion shall be compatible	with fish

- Fish passage at intake at current diversion shall be compatible with fish passage laws.
  - Upstream
     Downstream

screen/passage laws.

- c. Range
  - i. Maximum, Achievable
    - 1. Invisible to Fish
  - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
    - 1. Appropriate Flows
    - 2. Redundancy of Flows
    - 3. Improved Geomorphic Conditions
    - 4. Ability to Control Temperature
      - a. Shade and Natural Conditions
      - b. Correct Temperatures

- 5. Effluent
  - a. Nutrient Control
  - b. Feces Control
- 6. Compatible with ESA
- 7. Compatible with CWA

#### 2. Icicle Creek Restoration Project -Structure 2 Modification

- a. Goals/Objectives
  - i. Provide fish passage
  - ii. Restore a more historic flow regime
- b. Possible Solutions
  - i. Vertical Slotted Weir
    - 1. Passage of some of the fish some of the time
    - 2. Reduces flow capacity
    - 3. Does not pass juvenile fish well (reduces habitat)
  - ii. Roughened channel entire width of historic channel's upper reach
  - iii. Construct step pool structures
  - iv. Abandon structure 2
    - Will need to determine manner in which to recharge well system/ground water
      - Some existing wells are in a shallow aquifer supplied by infiltration from the head of the flood control channel
      - May have legal issues regarding utilizing surface water to recharge wells
    - 2. Will need to address flood control issue
    - 3. Will need to maintain pool characteristics to attract fish
- c. Range
  - i. Maximum, Achievable
    - Allow for annual flexibility, minimize impediments, and keep flows as high as possible
  - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
    - 1. Some Impediment

# 3. Icicle Creek Restoration Project -Structure 5 Modification

- a. Goals/Objectives
  - i. Wild fish passage and maintain tribal fishery (Spring Chinook).
    - Tribe will allow some Spring Chinook leakage (assume May 15 to July 7)
- b. Possible Solutions
  - i. Fish Trap and Sorter
    - 1. Negative
      - a. Need for staff
      - b. Fish Avoidance Behavior
      - c. Economic Cost
      - d. Need to reduce flows

- e. Excessive Fish Handling Aspect
- 2. Positive
  - a. Better Flow Control
  - b. Ability to control and sort fish
- ii. Inflatable weir
- iii. Manipulate Pickets
- c. Range
  - i. Maximum, Achievable
    - Allow for annual flexibility, minimize impediments, and keep flows as high as possible
  - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
    - 1. Some Impediment (Up to Two Months)
- 4. Monitoring Program
  - a. Goals/Objectives
    - Develop a monitoring program to satisfy stakeholders, including what is monitored, when monitoring occurs, and who performs and reviews monitoring
  - b. Possible Solutions
    - i. Develop plan, data points and collection methods jointly
    - ii. Establish a percentage of third party data collection
    - iii. Establish a percentage of Services collection
    - iv. Establish a percentage of third party data review
      - 1. Independent Laboratory
      - 2. National Academy of Sciences (NAS)
    - v. Establish a percentage of Services data review
  - c. Range
    - i. Maximum, Achievable
      - 1. All Third Party Performance
    - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
      - 1. Some Service Performance
- 5. Compatibility with Laws
  - a. Goals/Objectives
    - b. Develop a plan to ensure compatibility with appropriate and applicable laws such as ESA, CWA, Washington State Fish Passage
  - c. Possible Solutions
    - i. See objective development for Water Supply, Structure 2 Modification, Structure 5 Modification and Monitoring
  - d. Range
    - i. Maximum, Achievable
      - 1. 100% within 5 years
    - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
      - Continual incremental steps with water system addressed first followed by fish passage



#### 6. Disease

- a. Goals/Objectives
  - i. Minimize disease to wild fish and hatchery fish
  - ii. Release healthy hatchery fish
- b. Possible Solutions
  - i. See objective development for Water Supply, and Monitoring
- c. Range
  - i. Maximum, Achievable
    - 1. No increase in disease to wild fish and hatchery fish
  - ii. Minimum, Acceptable
    - 1. At a level that does not adversely impact production

# Step 3: Project Alternative Solutions Study (PASS) Technical Team Development\*

	Expertise Area		
1.	. Fish Passage and Screening		
2.	Biologist		
3.	. Fish Health		
4.	. Hydro Geologist		
5.	Ground Water/Hydrology		
6.	Hydraulic Engineer		
7.	. Geo-morphologist		
8.	Ecologist		
9.	General Civil Engineer		

## GOAL Team Point of Contact for Team Member Recruitment

- 1. Dale Bambrick
- 2. Chris Jansen Lute
- 3. David Morgan
- 4. Kurt Beardslee
- 5. Julie Collins

\*A decision will be made shortly on whether it is appropriate to facilitate the technical team as a Value Engineering Study. This would not change the focus of the team but would modify some preparation and study steps.

Deleted: Miscellaneous Contact

Information¶
David Owsley, Environmental Engineer Consultant (Pumping & Water Quality)¶ 2076 Konkolville¶

Orofino, ID 83544¶

208-476-3622 (p)¶ daveowsley@hotmail.com¶

Deleted: to

Deleted: assemble

Deleted: Team